

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT SEATTLE

11 C.F., *et al.*,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 LASHWAY, *et al.*,

15
16 Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-1205RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
AND RELIEF FROM DEADLINE

17 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration and Relief from
18 Deadline. Dkt. #73. On January 10, 2018, Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File First Amended
19 Complaint (Dkt. #64) was granted in part and denied in part. *See* Dkt. #72. In that Order, Plaintiff
20 was permitted leave to file an amended complaint to remove Plaintiff J.P. and her next friend, to
21 amend their proposed class definition, to clarify allegations about Defendants' policies and
22 practices, and to name the OFM as a defendant. *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff, however, was not permitted to
23 add the Arc of Washington as an organizational plaintiff. *Id.* at 4–5. Plaintiffs were ordered to
24 file their amended complaint by January 17, 2018. *See id.* at 5. Plaintiffs now seek reconsideration
25

1 of the Court's partial denial and also ask the Court to stay the deadline set forth in the Court's prior
2 Order (Dkt. #72) pending resolution of this motion. Dkt. #73 at 2. The Court has reviewed
3 Plaintiffs' motion and remains unpersuaded.

4 "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored." Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Consequently, the
5 Court will "ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior
6 ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the
7 Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* Plaintiffs fail to meet this standard.
8 Instead of showing a manifest error in the Court's Order, or directing the Court to new facts or legal
9 authority which could not have been brought to the Court's attention earlier, Plaintiffs' motion for
10 reconsideration merely posits new arguments to support Plaintiffs' requested addition of the Arc of
11 Washington as an organizational plaintiff. *See* Dkt. #73 at 2–6. Plaintiffs have already been given
12 two opportunities (in their motion to amend and their reply to Defendants' opposition to that
13 motion) to explain why the Arc of Washington should be added as a plaintiff, and the Court will
14 not allow Plaintiffs to use Local Civil Rule 7(h) to present arguments it could have previously set
15 forth. Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration, as well as its request for relief from the January 17,
16 2018, deadline to file their amended complaint, is accordingly DENIED.
17
18

19 DATED this 17th day of January 2018.
20

21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25